

Docket No.: JAEC-10213
Application No.: 10/810,478
Amendment Date: February 21, 2007
Reply of Office Action of: December 13, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 15-21, 27-28, 30 and 44 are pending in the application. Claims 1-14, 17, 22-26, 29, and 31-43 have been canceled. Claims 15, 16, 28 and 44 are rejected and claims 17-21, 27 and 30 are objected to. Applicant requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and arguments.

Examiner states that claims 7-21 are objected to, but Applicant believes this to be a typographical error. Applicant believes that Examiner meant claims 17-21 are objected to.

Rejections Under Section 102

Examiner rejects claims 15-16, 28 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lawrence '430.

Examiner states that claims 17-21, 27 and 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant points out that claim 15 is an independent claim from which claims 16-21, 27-28 and 30 depend, either directly or indirectly. Hence, according to Examiner, claims 17-21, 27-28 and 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form with the limitations of independent claim 15. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, but to expedite the issuance of this application, Applicant has chosen to add the limitations of claim 17 into independent claim 15. Applicant has also added the limitations of claim 17 into independent claim 44, which should put claim 44 in condition for allowance.

In particular, Lawrence does not teach, disclose or suggest the structure of the body receiver defining an opening which forms a socket in the vehicle body or truck bed, as claimed in claims 15 and 44, respectively. Lawrence also does not teach, disclose or suggest an

Docket No.: JAEC-10213
Application No.: 10/810,478
Amendment Date: February 21, 2007
Reply of Office Action of: December 13, 2006

accessory selectively received in the at least one body receiver, wherein the accessory includes an insert extending through the socket. Applicant points out that the word “receiver” has been replaced with the phrase “body receiver” in claims 15 and 44 so they read better.

Docket No.: JAEC-10213
Application No.: 10/810,478
Amendment Date: February 21, 2007
Reply of Office Action of: December 13, 2006

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Applicant believes claims 15-16, 18-21, 27-28, 30 and 44 are now in condition for allowance and requests a timely Notice of Allowance for this application. If any fees, including extension of time fees are due as a result of this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 19-0513. This authorization is intended to act as a constructive petition for an extension of time, should an extension of time be needed as a result of this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 21, 2007

By: /Greg L. Martinez/

Greg L. Martinez

Reg. No. 53,276

Customer No. 23123
SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS LLP
18 East University Drive, #101
Mesa, AZ 85201
(480) 655-0073